DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 371 HE 003 597

TITLE	[Proposed Changes in the Faculty By-Laws of Dickinson College.]
INSTITUTION	Dickinson Coll., Carlisle, Pa.
PUB DATE	1 Mar 72
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Faculty; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Higher Education; Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

In March of 1972 the Subcommittee on a Legislative Body of the College Committee on Institutional Priorities and Resources at Dickinson College proposed several resolutions that would include certain students and administrators as voting members of the Faculty Committee, a governing body that handles legislation and regulation in academic matters and in the area of student behavior. The students and administrators were to be those who served on a College Committee as a voting member. The voting privileges of these students and administrators would be restricted in that they would not be permitted to participate in (1) votes pertaining to academic or social status of individuals; (2) votes on faculty by-laws; and (3) votes to elect the Secretary of the Faculty, the Parliamentarian, or faculty members of committees. Background information is presented that tells how the proposed resolutions were conceived. The proposals as submitted in March were defeated by the Faculty Committee. (HS)

ED 070371

March 1, 1972

TO: All Faculty
Students and Administrators attending faculty meetings

FROM: College Committee on Institutional Priorities and Resources
Subcommittee on a Legislative Body

At the faculty meeting on March 6, 1972, we shall move the following three resolutions, which call for changes in the Faculty By-Laws effective with the beginning of the 1972-73 academic year.

1. RESOLVED: That effective at the start of the 1972-73 academic year section 1 of the Dickinson College Faculty By-Laws, which reads:

1(a) Chapter IV of the By-Laws of the College provides "The Faculty shall consist of the President of the College, who shall serve as its presiding officer, the Dean of the College, the Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors, who shall be elected by the Board, together with such others as may be constituted members thereof by the Board of Trustees."

(b) Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and full time Instructors each shall have one vote.

be amended by the addition of a third subsection, to read as follows:

(c) Each student having a vote on a College Committee shall have one vote with the faculty except on

(1) votes pertaining to academic or social status of individuals

(2) votes on faculty by-laws

(3) votes to elect the Secretary of the Faculty, the Parliamentarian, or faculty members of committees.

HE 00 3 597

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Comment

This resolution would permit the twenty three (23) students who are voting members of the six College Committees (Academic Program, Institutional Priorities and Resources, Academic Standards, Student Affairs, Admissions and Financial Aid, Communications and Development) to vote with the faculty in faculty meetings. Since it represents an addition to the Faculty By-Laws a two-thirds majority is required.

The resolution does not make these students members of the faculty or change the definition of a faculty member, but merely extends the voting privilege to additional people who presently sit with the faculty without vote.

2. RESOLVED: That effective at the start of the 1972-73 academic year section 1 of the Dickinson College Faculty By-Laws be further amended by the addition of a fourth sub-section, to read as follows:

(d) Each administrator having a vote on a College Committee shall have one vote with the faculty except on

(1) votes pertaining to academic or social status of individuals

(2) votes on faculty by-laws

(3) votes to elect the Secretary of the Faculty, the Parliamentarian, or faculty members of committees

Comment

This resolution is exactly parallel to the first, but would permit the members of the administration who are voting members of the College Committees to vote with the faculty. The following administrators are involved:

Executive Director of Development and Communications
*Director of Public Affairs
Alumni Secretary
Dean of Students
Dean of Men
Dean of Women
Director of Admissions
Registrar

*This position has recently been terminated. Thus the maximum number of voting administrators would be nine.

In addition, there sit on the College Committee on Institutional Priorities and Resources "Administrators: 2, appointed by the President of the College." These two, plus the eight named above, make a total of 10 administrators as the maximum number who would be entitled to vote if the resolution is passed. At present the two administrators sitting on the Committee are the Business Manager and the Executive Director of Development and Communications.

3. RESOLVED: That effective at the start of the 1972-73 academic year the sections of the Dickinson College Faculty By-Laws indicated below be amended by the addition of the insertion of the underlined phrases, so that they shall read as follows.

2(b) "The faculty shall meet in special session at the call of the President of the College or upon written request from five or more voting members of the faculty, <u>not including non-faculty voters</u>."

4 "Members shall make a reasonable effort to attend the regular and special meetings of the faculty. The presence of a majority of the voting members of the faculty, <u>not including non-faculty voters and</u> not including members on leave, shall constitute a quorum."

6(b) "Upon the request of any two voting members present, <u>including non-faculty voters</u>, the faculty shall use a written ballot. Elections or questions involving a choice between persons by name shall require a written ballot unless there is but a single nominee for an office."

7(b) "A majority of the voting members, <u>including non-faculty voters</u>, present at any meeting may change the order of business for that meeting."

8(a) "Officers, committees, and individuals, <u>including non-faculty voters</u>, intending to present proposals to the meeting shall provide advance notice thereof to each member of the faculty by distribution through the Service Center of the text of their motion. Notices must be in the respective boxes of the members at least five days in advance of the time of the meeting."

11(b) "The officers or committees authorized in <u>a</u> above to conduct hearings, shall upon written request from three or more voting members of the faculty (<u>not including non-faculty voters</u>) hold open hearings on subjects within their purview."

16(a) "Three-fourths of the voting members present or a majority of all voting members of the faculty, whichever is greater but not including non-faculty voters, shall be required to suspend a By-Law of the faculty relating to the transaction of business at that meeting." (May 5, 1969)

16(b) "Not less than one month's notice shall be given of amendments proposed for the By-Laws of the faculty. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the voting members present, not including non-faculty voters, shall be required to adopt the proposed revision.

Comment

This resolution is intended to remove the possibility of confusion about our interpretation of the phrases "voting members" and "voting members of the faculty". The interpretations are the same as in the document we presented at the December faculty meeting, but in this resolution are written into the by-laws themselves at the appropriate places.

GOVERNANCE

DICKINSON COLLEGE CASE STUDY

Third Session

Tuesday, April 18, 1972 - 9 a.m.

Memorial Hall, Old West

Dickinson College Case Study
Third Session: GOVERNANCE
April 18, 1972, Tuesday, 9 a.m.

During the period 1962-72, the formal and informal decision-making procedures of Dickinson College have undergone considerable change. The changes were gradual; the process can readily be described as 'incremental.' As in the previous session, our question is once more what incrementalism means and how it functions as one of the defining characteristics in an institution's life.

The opening presentation for this third session will attempt to trace in detail the manner in which these recent changes in governance have occurred. It will be argued that incrementalism, in this instance at least, was not the cautious passage of an idea across countless hazards toward the castle perilous whereat its triumph is finally celebrated. On the contrary, governance changes were the salvage of a clash among contending blueprints for change, the product of purposes pursued in a context where decision-making power is pluralized and compromise a necessity. During the seminar discussion this thesis might further be explored, contrasted with alternative interpretations, and assessed for its usefulness as a method of social change.

The factual narrative which follows should help set a background against which the issues to be raised in this session can be better focused.

Phase One

By 1962 the College was operating within a newly instituted governance system. Prior to President Rubendall's tenure, the responsibilities of the faculty had been in part circumvented by administrative fiat and in part controlled by the president's power to appoint the members of all faculty committees. Student government was non-existent; fraternity and sorority organizations dominated student life and concerned themselves only tangentially with the affairs of the College as a whole. Dickinson, clearly, was run by its administration.

Rubendall, however, had embraced the recommendations of AAUP in matters governmental. One of his first acts was to grant the faculty the right to elect its own committee membership. Rubendall also encouraged students to strengthen their moribund Student Senate, to begin developing effective forms of student-wide government. Thus in the early 'sixties Dickinson reorganized itself into a form for decision-making marked by the relative autonomy of faculty, administrative, and student components. Legislation and regulation in academic matters and in the area of student behavior were understood to be the prerogative of the faculty. The administration handled all fiscal and managerial matters: from the annual budget to fund raising, from publicity to the book store. Students diligently studied their parliamentary rules, practicing for the real world into which they would soon graduate.

This arrangement seemed to work well. Each of the three components was satisfied to consolidate its gains and to exhaust its energies in its own internecine struggles. But in the spring of 1966, while approving minor changes in the faculty committee structure, a resolution allowing student representatives to attend meetings of the Student Affairs Committee was introduced but defeated. By the end of the next academic year, however, student participation, without vote, on most faculty committees had become a reality. The initiative for involving students had been left to each committee's own discretion. Once one of the committees decided to admit students, however, it was difficult for the others not to. At the May 1967 meeting, the faculty acknowledged a fait accompli by approving student participation on a regular basis. The pressure for this change had come from the students. It was the first sign of a growing student demand to be involved in making the decisions which affect them.

Phase Two

Early in the fall of 1968 a group of faculty prepared a proposal recommending creation of a College Cabinet. Interestingly, all were members of the local AAUP executive committee. In response primarily to faculty complaints about the inordinate amount of time spent in committee work, these persons proposed a small elective body which would serve as the administrative and legislative organ of the College. The idea was to authorize a small group of faculty and students to carry on most of the

day-to-day business of the community. This would free the remaining faculty and students to pursue their studies unburdened by the responsibilities of government. Administrators were conceived exclusively as 'civil servants.' They would, under this new plan, find themselves answering to new bosses; but they were not themselves to be participants in the decision making.

Student demands for more participation and faculty demands for less were dovetailing. The faculty's Policy Committee took the new and quite startling proposal under advisement. In December 1968 it voted by a narrow margin, to create a student-faculty subcommittee to consider the proposal along with any others that might be submitted. During an intensive two-month period the ad hoc subcommittee received a variety of proposals, wide-ranging in their imaginative boldness and often surprising for their degree of sophistication. In February the subcommittee made its report, proposing a bicameral legislative system in combination with a strong College Cabinet. The Faculty Meeting and Student Senate would bicamerally decide issues referred to them by the Cabinet whenever it lacked the necessary 80% consensus to act on its own. The Cabinet was to be supported by a committee system comprised of students and faculty in various proportions. This was substantially the original proposal but with the details worked out.

The subcommittee requested the Policy Committee, and eventually the faculty, to approve in principle the concept of a Cabinet and bicameral legislature, and then to charge the subcommittee with the task of preparing recommendations in detail. The Policy Committee did not take up the report until very near the close of the school year, and after considerable discussion returned it to the subcommittee without either approving or disapproving. It requested that more detailed recommendations be prepared.

Meantime the faculty had voted to invite students serving on faculty committees to attend Faculty Meetings, with voice but not vote. The faculty committees were also empowered, at their discretion, to give the vote to their student members. Some did; some did not.

With the new academic year of 1969-70, the new ad hoc subcommittee decided to separate the question of cabinet and legislature from the question of the committee structure supporting it. It was agreed that the existing committee system was redundant in the sense that the Student Senate's various committees parallelled the faculty's. In place of this the ad hoc subcommittee proposed a system of all-College committees comprised of elected student and faculty representatives. In addition, and for the first time, administrators were conceived as members of the College community, and thus deserving to be adequately represented on the various committees.

In many cases the new all-College committees were replicas of the faculty committees except for the changes in membership. In one instance

especially, however, this was not the case. The faculty Policy Committee was supplanted by an Institutional Priorities and Resources Committee charged with the mandate to advise the President in matters of annual and capital budgets, long-range planning, and overall goals and priorities. Although this was the most revolutionary of the new recommendations, it was not the most controversial. The subcommittee's most debated recommendation, and the one which took the longest time to secure committee agreement on, was that the faculty Personnel Committee become an all-College committee with adequate student representation.

These resolutions were approved in April 1970 by substantial margins, with the exception of the Personnel Committee proposal which was roundly defeated. The philosophy behind the approved proposals and, after the April vote, partly incarnate in the governing processes of the College is summarized in the following preamble to the subcommittee's recommendations:

1. Dickinson College is a community. A decision affecting some members affects, to varying degrees, all members.

2. Those affected by decisions should have a say in formulating and implementing them. It is important that diverse perspectives be adequately represented in the various decision-making bodies. But adequacy does not necessarily imply parity.

3. Those with competence in particular areas should have a say in formulating and implementing decisions relating to those areas. The members of the college community have differing needs, differing talents, differing responsibilities. These differences should be respected and used for the common good. The members of the community are interdependent, but their roles are not interchangeable.

4. Government in the college community should be representative. For the process of decision-making to be effective, some must act in behalf of all. But those who make decisions should be responsive to the interests of the rest through procedures of accountability and distributed responsibility.

Phase Three

Also during the spring of 1970 the ad hoc subcommittee turned its attention to the legislative question. It rejected the Phase Two proposals. It found the College Cabinet too small a body to be adequately responsive to the varying interests of the College community, and too demanding in terms of time and talent for its members to serve on it less than full time. The subcommittee also rejected the idea of a bicameral body as an unnecessarily cumbersome system, especially in the absence of a Cabinet, and as re-creating the redundancy of effort which the single all-College committee structure had been designed to overcome.

The possibility of a unicameral College Senate was proposed as an alternative. Initial debate having made it clear the proposal had little support, further discussion was postponed until the following year. A resolution proposed in May 1970 as an interim measure advocated giving students and administrators who sit on the all-College committees a vote in the Faculty Meeting. The resolution won a majority of votes but fell slightly short of the two-thirds approval required.

An almost wholly new committee, in the new academic year of 1970-71, turned its attention to the unresolved issue of a College Senate.

The task was to devise a legislative body large enough to be adequately representative and at the same time small enough to be efficient. Students pressed for a favorable percentage of representation. Faculty were worried about abandoning their 'town meeting' traditions for a system of elected representatives. In the spring of 1971 a proposal was submitted to create a College Senate of one hundred persons, half faculty, forty students, and ten administrators. Faculty, student, and administration senators would be elected by their respective constituencies. The powers of the Senate were to be partially limited, the faculty reserving its authority in a wide range of areas including the power in special session to override the Senate. To a lesser extent, the student body was also given demurrer power over Senate decisions.

The proposal stirred torrid debate within the College community. When presented at the April 1971 Faculty Meeting, it was--without any debate whatsoever--soundly defeated. The subcommittee, and its parent all-College Committee on Institutional Priorities and Resources, sought to determine whether the faculty's opposition was directed toward the specific proposals or against the notion of a unicameral legislative body as such. It was finally decided to poll faculty sentiment.

In the fall of 1971 the subcommittee took its poll. It found only minority sympathy for a representative Senate. But it did find a slight majority of faculty in favor of extending the vote in some way to students and administrators. Consequently a new legislative proposal was prepared

enfranchising those students and administrators who sit on the all-College committees. It differed from the resolution of May 1970 in specifically excluding non-faculty votes on questions pertaining to individuals and to amendments to the by-laws. The resolution received majority support from the faculty at its March 1972 meeting, but failed to obtain the two-thirds majority needed for passage.